



Guam One-Stop Data Village (GOSDV)

GOSDV Education Agenda for Research (GEAR) Workshop

Friday, October 23, 2020 at 2:00 – 4:00 pm via Zoom

Inquiries: Please send to Dr. Zenaida Napa Natividad <znnatividad@gdoe.net>

2020 GEAR Workshop Final Report

Part I. Background and Purposes of the 2020 GEAR Workshop

In 2017, the Joint Boards of Education consisting of the Department of Education Guam Education Board, the Guam Community College (GCC) Board of Trustees, and the University of Guam (UOG) Board of Regents and key professional staff of these three public funded institutions participated in a first ever Guam Education Agenda for Research (GEAR). During that workshop, the participants were provided a cross-walk and analytical examination of the strategic plan, priorities, and statement of commitments of these three institutions. This aforementioned document depicted the goals and priorities common to the three institutions that guided the identification, development, and selection of research questions that would address those common priorities. These common research questions were identified as the research priorities of the Joint Boards in fulfillment of their joint responsibilities articulated in 17 GCA 16A §16101(a) and (b).

A key research question that has been of great interest to the Joint Boards is the **transition of students from K12 to postsecondary education**. *What happens to GDOE graduates who apply for entry or enter postsecondary education? Do they succeed (or fail) in their application? Do they succeed (or fail) in their first year of college? What factors contributed to success (or failure)? What percentage of those who apply end up in developmental courses instead of in credit-bearing college courses?*

The above-stated research questions require the collection of data from GDOE, GCC, and UOG. Under the current data collection and data repository system, each educational institution has its own student information systems that do not necessarily “speak” to one another. GDOE uses PowerSchool, UOG uses Ellucian Colleague, and GCC utilizes cloud technology. The task of tracking how many GDOE graduates enroll at UOG or GCC is cumbersome and tedious and does not fully inform education stakeholders. Counts and percentages do little to explain the context and meaning of the data and sometimes even raise more questions than answers. The dearth of knowledge on the transition of Guam public school students to college has been and will continue to be the plight of key policy makers and decision leaders year in and year out as budgets are developed, approved, and expended with little to inform their key policy decisions.

In 2018, the GDOE collaborated with the GCC and UOG to develop a strategy to address the lack of information on student transition and achievement K12 to postsecondary. The strategy became a full-blown data infrastructure system plan akin to the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) that have been established in 49 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa through six rounds of federal funding from the U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences (IES) National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

During the seventh round of funding in 2019, Guam applied for the **SLDS competitive grant and received \$3.25M to establish the SLDS infrastructure** that would enable the collection, standardization, and linking of the student data systems of DOE, GCC, and UOG. Dubbed as the **Guam One Stop Data Village (GOSDV)**, this linked data system will be built through joint efforts of the three institutions consisting not only of establishing the infrastructure data system, but also the creation of an interagency data governance committee. This committee will develop the policies, procedures, and priorities of the GOSDV to include data privacy and confidentiality following federal and local laws, data collection and data destruction, data breach protocols, standardization of data elements of the three institutions in light of the federal Common Education

Data Standards (CEDS), development and publication of the data dictionary containing CEDS-aligned data elements, and the continuous review and update of the Guam Education Agenda for Research.

The GOSDV focuses on three major data uses (the three R's) of GOSDV: **R**esearch, **R**eport, and **R**aising student achievement for students to be ready for college and career. The “**R**esearch” use of the GOSDV addresses the **Guam Education Agenda for Research (GEAR)** developed in 2017 by the Guam Joint Boards of Education. The GEAR has 9 sub-sections spanning many key education issues but the GOSDV will focus on “Student Transition from 12th grade to post-secondary” research questions, such as “*What percentage of GDOE graduates end up in developmental courses at UOG and GCC? What factors help or hinder GDOE graduates in succeeding in college level work at UOG and GCC?*” The “**R**eport” use of the GOSDV aims to automate local and federal reporting requirements such as ED*Facts*, School Performance Report Card, etc. The “**R**aising student achievement” component of the GOSDV is to make available data for state and district level research aimed at raising student achievement for successful transition from high school to college.

To achieve the three R's, the GOSDV project aims to accomplish the following goals:

- O**rganize and implement the Interagency Data Governance Program (Goal 1)
- N**eed to update the **GEAR**, identify data elements, and align with CEDS (Goals 2 & 3)
- E**stablish the infrastructure and link the data systems (Goals 4 & 5)
- S**ystematize local and federal report production (Goal 6)
- T**argeted training for all stakeholders to foster culture of data use (Goal 7)
- O**n-going assessment and evaluation for systematic improvement (Goal 8)
- P**lan for sustainability through Legislative Exposure to GOSDV System or LEGS (Goal 9)

The GEAR Workshop conducted on October 23, 2020 aimed to accomplish the following:

- ✓ To review the transition research questions identified during the 2017 Joint Education Boards research agenda workshop
- ✓ To identify policies that may be informed by the transition research questions either for improvement of such policies or the creation of new ones
- ✓ To forge a possible joint partnership between research scientists that will pursue the research process and policy makers that will champion the creation or improvement of education policies informed by the selected research activity
- ✓ To engender discussions of research-informed policy through presentation of findings of such research partnership in a Guam Data Summit and eventually in the Annual SLDS Best Practices Conference held in Washington DC in the spring.

Part II of this report consists of the outcomes of the October 2020 GEAR Workshop, the registration process, composition of the workshop, and facilitators and note takers during sub-group discussions.

A video on the 2020 GEAR Workshop was presented as a recorded session at the 2020 SLDS Best Practices Conference conducted by the U.S. Department of Education in November 17-19, 2020.

Part II. Delivery and Outcomes of the 2020 GEAR Workshop

Registration

The first week of August 2020, GEAR workshop invitations from the Superintendent of the Guam Department of Education, were sent via email to various local and off-island agencies. The email included the following attachments: background information about GOSDV, the GOSDV grant abstract, and a registration form. These invitations indicated that the workshop was scheduled for August 28, 2020 however due to issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic the workshop was rescheduled to October 23, 2020 and reorganized as a 2-hour virtual convening.

Registration forms were returned via email in various formats. The information from completed registration forms were entered into a Google form. Also, a link to the Google form was released to GOSDV personnel with access to register. By October 22, 2020, 96 individuals had registered.

GEAR Workshop Personnel

As with any workshop, GOSDV and GDOE required personnel to facilitate the workshop, from which UOG and GCC provided assistance. The three conveners for the workshop were the Superintendent of Education, the President of UOG, and the President of GCC. The GOSDV Project Director (GDOE) and the Chairperson for Data Governance (UOG) directed the GEAR workshop. The design of the workshop was to cluster eleven existing research agenda questions into six separate break out rooms. Zoom meeting attendants were identified from GDOE to ensure smooth transition from plenary session into breakout rooms. Each breakout session had a facilitator and a note taker. The six facilitators were faculty members from the University of Guam who were responsible for the flow of the meeting and timing. The sessions were open for one hour to discuss respective research agenda question(s). A videographer was also identified to capture pictures and video of each session.

Attendance

The registration Google forms were reviewed and scrubbed for duplicates, and GEAR workshop personnel who did not register were added for this report. (See spreadsheet)

Over Attendance for Workshop

Total Registered 68

Total Attendance 78

(NOTE: The 10 additional names were GEAR workshop personnel or GOSDV personnel)

Participants registered and indicated which of 10 research agenda questions interested them most. The ten research questions were clustered into six manageable breakout rooms. The attendance rates are as follows:

Breakout Rooms

Group One – 9 of 14 recorded or 64%

Group Two - 7 of 10 recorded or 70%

Group Three – 8 of 11 recorded or 73%

Group Four – 3 of 8 recorded or 38%

Group Five 12 of 16 recorded or 75%

Group Six – 5 of 12 recorded or 42%

Overall Attendance for Breakout Rooms – 51 of 64 recorded or 80%

The following agencies were in attendance:



Number of Attendees	Department/Agency
01	Attorney General
10	GCC Administration and Faculty
20	GDOE Administration and Faculty
06	Guam Education Board
01	Governor's Office
01	Legislature
03	Other
01	PREL
03	REL
33	UOG Administration and Faculty
78	Grand Total

2020 GEAR WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS BY GROUP

2020 GEAR Workshop Group 1 (8 Total Participants) Facilitator: Dr. Dean Olah Note Taker: Nikki Monforte	
Research questions: What factors impact student transition from secondary to postsecondary education? A specific area of interest is in students with potential barriers to postsecondary education such as those receiving a standard diploma, limited English proficient (LEP) students, economically disadvantaged, minority race/ethnicity, homelessness, at-risk status, special needs status Which schools are transitioning a greater proportion of their high school graduates for colleges and universities ready for college level work?	
Deborah Leon Guerrero	UOG Vice Provost
Dr. Anita Enriquez	UOG Senior Vice President & Provost
Dr. Samantha Holquist	REL Pacific
Dr. Sharleen Santos-Bamba	UOG Associate Dean, CLASS
Dr. Chris Garcia	UOG Faculty
Carol Simpson Warner	UOG Faculty
Dr. Michael Chan	GCC Dean of Enrollment
Maria Gutierrez	Guam Education Board
Jon J.P. Fernandez	GDOE Superintendent

2020 GEAR Workshop GROUP 2 (7 Total Participants) Facilitator: Dr. Michelle Santos Note Taker: Ana Mari Atoigue	
Research question: Does participation in Career and Technical Education prepare GDOE graduates for GCC courses?	
Carla Masnayan	GDOE School Principal
Billie-Jo Marzan	GDOE Counselor
Carol Sanchez	Attorney General's Office
Kenny Miranda	GCC Board of Trustees
Natasha Saelua	REL Pacific
Dr. Mary Okada	GCC President
Marlena Montague	GCC Asst. Director Assessments
Marivic Shrage	GCC Board of Trustees

2020 GEAR Workshop Group 3 (8 Total Participants) Facilitator: Dr. Yukiko Inoue-Smith Note Taker: Dennis Bakker	
Research question: Is the ACT Aspire (DOE's district-wide assessment) a good predictor of success in postsecondary education? Analyze by gender, ethnicity, LEP status, poverty level status, and special needs status.	
Cheryl Sourgose	GDOE Administrator
Evangeline Iglesias	GDOE Administrator
Rufina F. Mendiola	GDOE Administrator
Josephine Cruz	UOG Faculty
Hendrick Cho	PREL Program Manager
Felicitas "Fely" B. Angel	Guam Education Board
Lawrence Jay M. Alcairo	Guam Education Board
Dr. Genevieve L.G. Garrett	UOG Faculty

2020 GEAR Workshop Group 4 (3 Total Participants) Facilitator: Prof. Terry Perez Note Taker: Alice Bonto	
Research questions: What proportion of students is college ready when they graduate from high school as measured by proficiency in GDOE achievement tests, UOG and GCC placement tests? How did COFA (Compact of Free Association) students compare with non-COFA students relative to UOG and GCC Placement exams? What proportion of COFA students is college ready when they graduate from high school as measured by proficiency on GDOE achievement tests, UOG and GCC placement tests, and no need for remedial coursework?	
Katrina Quinata	UOG Academic Advisor
Simone Bollinger	GCC Assistant Professor
Rose Castro	GDOE Administrator

2020 GEAR Workshop Group 5 (12 Total Participants) Facilitator: Dr. Melissa Taitano Note Taker: Trini MacDuff	
Research questions: What are the postsecondary experiences of high school students (including postsecondary enrollment, remediation, persistence, completeness)? What are the postsecondary experiences of high school COFA students (including postsecondary enrollment, remediation, persistence, completeness)?	
Mark Duarte	UOG Dir. Student Fin. Aid
Dr. Cathy Cardenas	UOG Faculty
Dr. Christina Tydeman	REL Pacific Director
Dr. Perry Jason Pangelinan	UOG Faculty
Lei Bao	UOG Faculty
Dr. James Sellmann	UOG Dean, CLASS
Michelle Aguigui	UOG Administrator
Eden Galvez	UOG Graduate Admissions
Lynette Villagomez	PREL Research
Joann Susuico	GDOE Teacher
Lourdes Benavente	Guam Education Board
Manny Hechanova	UOG Interim Chief of Information Technology

2020 GEAR Workshop Group 6 (11 Total Participants) Facilitator: Dr. Lawrence F. Camacho Note Taker: Tina Alam	
Research Question: What levels of middle school achievement are associated with success in high school and college? Analyze by gender, ethnicity, LEP status, poverty level status, and special needs status.	
Duane Mantanona	GDOE Administrator
Mark B. Mendiola	Guam Education Board
Karlyn Borja	Guam Education Board
Doris Perez	GCC Assist. Director, Planning & Development
Lt. Governor Joshua Tenorio	Lt. Governor of Guam
Karen Quitugua	GCC Instructor
Estrella DeVera	GDOE Teacher
Vince dela Cruz -	GDOE Head of IT
Dr. Zenaida Natividad	GOSDV Project Director
Dr. Thomas Krise	UOG President
Dr. Alicia Aguon	UOG Dean, SOE
Dr. Yoshito Kawabata	UOG Faculty

Summation and Validation of Note Takers Sub-group Reports

The six groups were provided with a template for taking notes. The template provided seven topics for group discussion related to respective reach question(s). The facilitator and the note taker tracked the group discussions using the template. After the workshop, completed notes were submitted to GOSDV Stakeholder Chairperson to compile and summarize. Once the summary was drafted, it was sent to all facilitators and note takers to check for accuracy and validation. Each facilitator and note taker was given an opportunity to send corrections/adjustments to the notes via email. There were several iterations sent to the group based on their responses. Once corrections/adjustments were made, the compilation was sent again for final review from the six groups (facilitators and note takers). The draft of the validated notes was then provided to Tulos I Sakman (stakeholders committee) for review of narrative. Once the Tulos I Sakman had an opportunity to review the notes, a final draft was provided to GOSDV Leadership for the last review.

Summary of Seven Topics

The first topic for each of the six groups was *"Keywords and phrases"*. All groups appeared to point out keywords within their respective research question(s) without any reported issues. Some groups engaged in robust discussions surrounding specific words and phrases (see group one and group five notes). In contrast, others listed literal keywords and phrases.

The second topic for facilitators to discuss was *"Groups understanding of the research question(s)"*. Groups 3, 4, and 6 discussed defining certain words and defining data elements, while Groups 1 and 5 did not report any issues about understanding the questions."

"Group's version of the research question(s)", was the next topic for each breakout session. Groups 1 and 5 made no revisions to their respective research questions. Modifications were considered by Groups 2, 3, and 6, while Group 4 listed words and phrases within the research questions that needed to be further defined.

"Policy, decision, or practice impacted by the research" was the next topic on the agenda for each group. Group 1 indicated a need to further define words and phrases with the questions.

Groups 2, 3 and 4 appeared to agree that the research questions would impact policy and decision or practice. There was not enough information in the record for Groups 5 and 6 to indicate impact.

The fifth topic of discussion for the six groups was, *"Data elements needed to answer the research question(s)"*. All groups except for Group 5 provided a list of data elements for their respective research questions.

"Potential champion for the research project (must be a policymaker, decision-maker or education professional (optional))" was the next topic of discussion for the groups. Groups 5 and 6 did not provide information while all the other groups listed champions for their respective research question.

The last topic for the breakout sessions to discuss was *"Significant comments/ ideas/ suggestions"*. All groups recorded participant feedback either individually or collectively.

Workshop Evaluation

The workshop evaluation was created by the GOSDV Monitoring and Evaluation Sub-committee in collaboration with Tulos I Sakman, or the GOSDV Stakeholder and Outreach Committee. A link to the evaluation form was sent to all those who attended the workshop via email. The evaluation was set up by asking respondents about the overall set up of the workshop and the other section of the evaluation asked about their respective experiences within the breakout sessions. Based on the responses, 33 of the 45 (73%) who visited the evaluation linked completed the survey.

The results associated with the **overall experience** with workshop are as follows:

Well organized	79% strongly agree
Expectation and process was easy to follow	73% strongly agree
Use of Zoom was effective	58% strongly agree and 42% agree
Knowledge of GEAR increased	61% strongly agree and 42% agree
Time well spent	70% strongly agree

The results associated with the **break out room experience** are as follows:


The GEAR was relevant to Guam	91% strongly agree
Well organized	76% strongly agree
Productive	73% strongly agree
Facilitators were able to engage participants well	82% strongly agree
Participants were actively engaged	82% strongly agree 27% somewhat agree
Time allotted for break rooms	64% strongly agree and 21% somewhat agree

Other sections of the evaluation were for open ended questions for the breakout sessions and other interest in research for future GOSDV use.

Below are screen shots of the evaluation results as it appeared on the site:


**October 2020 SLDS GOSDV GEAR Workshop
Participant Responses to the Evaluation Survey**

Q3 - Please specify your role at this workshop (check all that apply):




Please select your response to the following regarding your **overall workshop experience**:


The workshop was well organized:




The presentation of the overview of GOSDV and GEAR Workshop expectations and processes was easy to follow and set the tone for the breakout sessions:




Conducting the workshop virtually in Zoom was effective:




My knowledge level was increased or enhanced as a result of attending the workshop:



I am satisfied with the time spent attending the workshop:



Which Breakout session did you attend?



#	Field	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
1	The research topic was relevant for the Guam Education Research Agenda:	91% 30	9% 3	0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	33
2	The session was well organized:	76% 25	18% 6	3% 1	3% 1	0% 0	33
3	The session discussion was productive:	73% 24	24% 8	3% 1	0% 0	0% 0	33
4	The facilitator was effective and well prepared:	79% 26	18% 6	0% 0	3% 1	0% 0	33
5	The facilitator was able to effectively engage the participants:	82% 27	6% 2	6% 2	6% 2	0% 0	33
6	I observed that my group participants were actively engaged:	67% 22	27% 9	3% 1	3% 1	0% 0	33
7	I am satisfied with the time allotted for the session:	64% 21	21% 7	6% 2	9% 3	0% 0	33

Open-ended Question: “Things I liked and/or learned as a result of attending this workshop:”

(Responses disaggregated by Breakout Groups)

Breakout Group: “What factors impact transition?”

- To have meaningful discussion with colleagues from other agencies
- I was able to hear several viewpoints, mostly from administrators.
- Great collaborative participation across different institutions with shared interests. Factors that are relevant to contribute to research agenda and possible research efforts by faculty and students, especially for master's thesis focus.
- Excellently organized. I especially enjoyed the various opinions and creative input of ideas.

Breakout Group: “Participation in Career Tech Education”

- The collaboration between public education institutions on Guam is evidence of our commitment to student success! Thank you for your great leadership, Doc Zeni!
- I enjoyed the rich conversation in analyzing the research question about how CTE high school courses prepare students to succeed in GCC CTE.
- I am glad that the 3 educational institutions are working together to establish a longitudinal database. This will help plan for and support current programs.

Breakout Group: “Is ACT Aspire a good predictor?”

- Thank you for the opportunity to be apart of GEAR. I look forward to working with my group further in the hopes to seeing how the data collection findings might offer additional insights to narrowing the academic achievement gap for our island children.
- I liked the efforts that are underway to use data to help better cater to the student experience. I also appreciate the coordination between the three education agencies.
- Everyone in my small group gave input and collaborated on the driving question and the choice of words to use/add/takeout from the question to make it more relevant and with understanding.
- Deciding as a collaborative group on the essential question that impacts student success/achievement. Listening to participants views on the questions or comments.
- Collaboration on topic matters, reasons on its significance, brainstorming ideas that are relevant and increased awareness of what the questions were reflected upon on the main topic. Informative insights that were clarified as to what the message of the topic matter was trying to get point across.

Breakout Group: “Proportion of students that are college ready”

- The collaborative effort to solicit feedback and work together
- I liked hearing from the participants from different institutions. I'm hoping to continue to be involved in this project as I think it has amazing potential to be used by many different people in very effective ways

Breakout Group: “Postsecondary experiences COFA, non-COFA”

- i liked the open discussion and sharing of ideas.
- The time structure was effective for a productive session. Facilitators and note takers were on point with their responsibilities. Facilitators knew how to engage the discussion. I was the only school level teacher within my group, which made it great to hear the thoughts of others at the higher education level. Overall, the entire workshop was productive and I look forward to contributing to this research.
- That we are a step closer to our goal that was discussed by the tri-Board a in 2017. Thank you to everyone for all you do and continue to do.
- I was surprised to learn how the word "experiences" is different for people in different fields. To me, it is clear cut and can be found with readily available data, to others, it meant qualitative data that we are still in need of.
- Although some of the participants in the breakout session were very engaged, there was a large number of others who weren't. Maybe a more structured way to engage "all" would help.

Breakout Group: “Middle school achievement and high school & postsecondary success”

- I really like how the zoom breaks sessions.
- I liked that there was a mix of group members sharing their understanding of the topics and sharing insights based on their perspective.
- I liked listening to the participants and their thoughts regarding middle school students. The participants sounded very interested in helping middle school students succeed.
- I did not attend a session

Open-ended Question: “Topics of interest to me for future GOSDV workshops”

- Results of research..
- Tracking student progress from elementary to post-secondary education.
- I am most interested in this: "Which schools are transitioning a greater proportion of their high school graduates for colleges and universities ready for college level work?"
- How research questions will be refined. How data will be collected. I'm also interested in hearing about the other breakout groups/topics from this workshop.
- ACT Aspire
- Perhaps this topic again! We did not finish.
- Technology and the island's future. How can we empower our people with resources to support life long learning, whether it is face to face or online?
- Post Secondary outcomes for our identified students under Special Education. Types of supports at the secondary level to prepare our SPED students for a post secondary job, schooling or independent living.
- Qualitative methods of exploring the student experience of transition to higher education.
- Family and Community Support that are important to student success. How do we close the gap of learning with support from family and community groups?
- Would like to see more student input.
- How technology affects the educational system.

Open-ended Question: “Comments, feedback, or recommendations pertaining to the venue, scheduling, or organization of this workshop”

- Virtual meetings are efficient, so please continue this modality even when PCOR1 is lifted.
- Zoom is good, but live, face-to-face sessions will be more productive in the future.
- I understand face-to-face meetings are not allowable, however, I feel there would be more discussion if the meeting was held face-to-face instead of virtually. BUT, I am still thankful for the opportunity to participate in such a worthwhile cause.
- Luckily our group was small, but one hour was barely enough time to scratch the surface. Hopefully we can continue on the topic now that we've had preliminary discussions on it. I kept thinking about it afterwards, and had more ideas.
- Excellent job and congratulations to the GEAR Committee.
- Now that we now how it goes, we definitely needed more time in the breakout groups. Perhaps another 30 minutes would have been sufficient
- This workshop worked out great! The time, date, location, and facilitators were synchronized.
- The workshop was greatly planned. I enjoyed the experience.
- May not apply to future workshops, but more time in breakout room would have been productive (1.5 hours?)
- none
- The breakout discussion seemed to be a little less organized and more of a free for all. Better discussion organization would be appreciated.
- Thank you for the opportunity to be a part of this project.
- Facilitators need to have better understanding of their topic. Should come in knowing exactly what the question is asking. Time was wasted talking
- about what the question meant
- Had an amazing time.